

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD**

KELVIN RICKY WATSON, JR.,
Appellant,

DOCKET NUMBER
AT-1221-16-0371-W-1

v.

SOCIAL SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION,
Agency.

DATE: November 23, 2016

THIS FINAL ORDER IS NONPRECEDENTIAL¹

Kelvin Ricky Watson, Jr., Esquire, Cary, North Carolina, pro se.

Jeffrey Wilson, Esquire, Atlanta, Georgia, for the agency.

BEFORE

Susan Tsui Grundmann, Chairman
Mark A. Robbins, Member

FINAL ORDER

¶1 The appellant has petitioned for review of the May 13, 2016 Initial Decision in this appeal. Initial Appeal File, Tab 8, Initial Decision; Petition for Review

¹ A nonprecedential order is one that the Board has determined does not add significantly to the body of MSPB case law. Parties may cite nonprecedential orders, but such orders have no precedential value; the Board and administrative judges are not required to follow or distinguish them in any future decisions. In contrast, a precedential decision issued as an Opinion and Order has been identified by the Board as significantly contributing to the Board's case law. See [5 C.F.R. § 1201.117\(c\)](#).

(PFR) File, Tab 1. For the reasons set forth below, we DISMISS the petition for review as settled.

¶2 After filing the petition for review, the parties submitted a document entitled “SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT” signed and dated by the appellant on August 15, 2016, and by the agency on August 16, 2016. PFR File, Tabs 4-5. The document provides, among other things, for dismissing the petition for review. *Id.*

¶3 Before dismissing a matter as settled, the Board must decide whether the parties have entered into a settlement agreement, understand its terms, and intend to have the agreement entered into the record for enforcement by the Board. *See Mahoney v. U.S. Postal Service*, [37 M.S.P.R. 146](#), 149 (1988). We find here that the parties have, in fact, entered into a settlement agreement, that they understand the terms, and that they agree that the agreement will not be entered into the record for enforcement by the Board. PFR File, Tab 5, ¶ 2.

¶4 Accordingly, we find that dismissing the petition for review “with prejudice to refiling” (i.e., the parties normally may not refile this appeal) is appropriate under these circumstances.

¶5 This is the final order of the Merit Systems Protection Board in this appeal. Title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulation, section 1201.113 ([5 C.F.R. § 1201.113](#)).

NOTICE TO THE APPELLANT REGARDING YOUR FURTHER REVIEW RIGHTS²

You have the right to request review of this final decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

² The initial decision did not afford the appellant notice of appeal rights under the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012. We have provided notice of such appeal rights herein.

The court must receive your request for review no later than 60 calendar days after the date of this order. See [5 U.S.C. § 7703\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#) (as rev. eff. Dec. 27, 2012). If you choose to file, be very careful to file on time. The court has held that normally it does not have the authority to waive this statutory deadline and that filings that do not comply with the deadline must be dismissed. See *Pinat v. Office of Personnel Management*, [931 F.2d 1544](#) (Fed. Cir. 1991).

If you want to request review of the Board's decision concerning your claims of prohibited personnel practices under [5 U.S.C. § 2302\(b\)\(8\)](#), (b)(9)(A)(i), (b)(9)(B), (b)(9)(C), or (b)(9)(D), but you do not want to challenge the Board's disposition of any other claims of prohibited personnel practices, you may request review of this final decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction. The court of appeals must receive your petition for review within 60 days after the date of this order. See [5 U.S.C. § 7703\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#) (as rev. eff. Dec. 27, 2012). If you choose to file, be very careful to file on time. You may choose to request review of the Board's decision in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or any other court of appeals of competent jurisdiction, but not both. Once you choose to seek review in one court of appeals, you may be precluded from seeking review in any other court.

If you need further information about your right to appeal this decision to court, you should refer to the Federal law that gives you this right. It is found in title 5 of the U.S. Code, section 7703 ([5 U.S.C. § 7703](#)) (as rev. eff. Dec. 27, 2012). You may read this law as well as other sections of the U.S. Code, at our website, <http://www.mspb.gov/appeals/uscode/htm>. Additional information about the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit is available at the court's website, www.ca9c.uscourts.gov. Of particular relevance is the court's "Guide for Pro Se Petitioners and Appellants," which is contained within the court's Rules of Practice, and Forms 5, 6, and 11. Additional information about other

courts of appeals can be found at their respective websites, which can be accessed through the link below:

http://www.uscourts.gov/Court_Locator/CourtWebsites.aspx.

If you are interested in securing pro bono representation for your appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you may visit our website at <http://www.mspb.gov/probono> for information regarding pro bono representation for Merit Systems Protection Board appellants before the Federal Circuit. The Merit Systems Protection Board neither endorses the services provided by any attorney nor warrants that any attorney will accept representation in a given case.

FOR THE BOARD:

Jennifer Everling
Acting Clerk of the Board

Washington, D.C.